THE

DRAMATIC CENSOR;

OR,

Weekly Theatrical Report.

NUMBER XIII.

SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1800.

Ferendi INGRATI *placido animo, mansueto, magno. Nunquam te beneficii immemor tam offendat, ut non tamen ei dedisse delectet. Nunquam te in has voces ejus injuria impellat: vellem non dedisse.*

Injustitiæ genera duo sunt, unum eorum, qui INFERUNT *injuriam; alterum eorum qui non* PROPULSANT. *Injuria autem nulla capitalior est, quam eorum, qui cum maxime fallunt, dant operam, ut viri boni videantur.*

DRAMATIC WRITERS, who desire to have an EARLY Review of their Publications, are requested to send a Copy to the Editor, at JUSTINS's Printing-Office, Pemberton Row, Gough Square.

DRURY-LANE, SATURDAY, *March* 22, 1800.

LOVE FOR LOVE—*Congreve.* OF AGE TO-MORROW.

IT is a great pity that the sterling wit and humour which characterize the works of this writer, should be blended with such grossness, as almost to proscribe the representation of this sprightly Comedy. This, however, it is but justice to observe, is a fault more imputable to the manners of the times in which the author lived, than to any inherent depravity of heart. When we mention the cast of the characters, all further comment on the excellence

of the performance will be superfluous. The *veteran* KING, who, when he adheres to his *professional* sphere, is always praise-worthy, sustained the character of *Sir Sampson Legend*; Mr. KEMBLE was the representative of *Valentine*; *Scandal* was personated by Mr. BARRYMORE; *Tattle*, by Mr. PALMER; and *Foresight*, by Mr. SUETT. BANNISTER seldom appears to greater advantage, than when he enacts the *sailor*. His delineation of *Ben* was animated and appropriate.

Miss BIGGS was the fair *Angelica*; Miss POPE, the dramatic *Mrs. Frail*; and Mrs. JORDAN, as *Prue*, commanded universal applause by her exquisite acting, and that *naievete* of manner, for which she is so justly extolled.

COVENT-GARDEN, SATURDAY, *March* 22, 1800

SPEED THE PLOUGH—*Morton.* COMUS—*Mutilated and parodied from Milton.*

THE Play went off with its accustomed popularity and success. But far different was the reception, which the Entertainment experienced. The part of *Comus* was *done* by HOLMAN, with all the *dull solemnity* of an *undertaker*. Indeed the whole of this gentleman's performance was a continual warfare between the *character* and the *action*. Sombre, saturnine, and soporific, instead of the mirthful, gay, and sprightly being, pourtrayed by the author, his countenance displayed the mechanical gravity

of

of a *parish clerk*, or an *assize judge*, passing sentence of death on a *sheep-stealer*. Not a single smile relaxed the uniform austerity of his features, which seemed to impart their baneful influence to the whole confederate *corps*. INCLEDON *sang* well; but his *voice* is his *only* recommendation. Those who prefer *jingle* to *rational* gratification, may derive pleasure from his performance. Whatever his *Bacchanalian* qualifications may be *off* the boards, *on the stage*, he is the very prototype of insipidity. *Euphrosyne* was degraded to an *Ethiop*, a downright *gypsey*, by Mrs. MARTYR. Miss CHAPMAN added another *cypher* to the account, as the *enchanted lady*; *Sabrina*, with her *chaste* attendants, enhanced the dulness of the scene, and the farce altogether made an impression on the audience, which, we are of opinion, will not tempt the Manager speedily to repeat its representation.

DRURY-LANE, MONDAY, *March* 24, 1800.

EGYPTIAN FESTIVAL—*Franklin.* THE DEVIL TO PAY —*Coffey.*

Mrs. JORDAN's comic talents are so universally known and acknowledged, that it is sufficient to *name* her, as the representative of *Nell*, in the Entertainment; Miss HEARD personated *Lady Loverule*, for the firſt time, and played with considerable spirit. DIGNUM, with the exception of his voice, is little better on the boards, than an *automaton*; his *Sir John* exhibits a striking *parody* of the character

drawn by the author. Apathy and dulness supply the place of sprightliness and animation. BANNISTER performs the part of *Jobson* with humour.

COVENT-GARDEN, MONDAY, *March* 24, 1800.

SPEED THE PLOUGH—*Morton.* RAYMOND AND AGNES—*Farley.*

DRURY-LANE, TUESDAY, *March* 25, 1800.

THE GAMESTER—*Moore.* OF AGE TO-MORROW.

As a moral lesson, few Dramas are fraught with such useful, necessary, and practical instruction as the *Gamester*. Combating, as it does, the prevailing vice of the age, and exposing the ruinous career of fashionable dissipation, in its true light; it were greatly to be wished, that this salutary warning might be more frequently inculcated to the young and thoughtless votaries of pleasure, folly, and extravagance.

COVENT-GARDEN, TUESDAY, *March* 25, 1800.

SPEED THE PLOUGH—*Morton.* ST. DAVID's DAY; OR, THE HONEST WELCHMAN—*Dibdin.*

THE author of the New Entertainment, performed this evening for the *first* (and were its fate dependant on its merits, we should have to say, the *last*) time, seems to be a kind of *dramatic pedlar*, whose wares advance in *number*, in proportion to their *vileness*. Nothing discomfited by miscarriage, he gathers confidence from disgrace, and no sooner witnesses the condemnation of one piece, than he falls

to

to work upon another. By a strange kind of fatality, it so happens, that the less deserving a writer is of encouragement, the greater in general is the patronage he experiences from the Manager. Hence Mr. DIBDIN is suffered to obtrude his *abortions* upon the town as rapidly as he produces them; whilst compositions of merit cannot obtain even the *honour of a reading* from those, who have taken upon themselves the office of caterers for the public.

To enter into the detail of a piece, which has neither plot nor dialogue to recommend it, would be a tedious and unprofitable taſk. One man loses a pocket book, containing a bank note of £100. value, on the Welch coast; another man, a native of the place, finds it, and stocks his farm. Several years after this event, the son of the rightful owner is shipwrecked on the very spot, and hospitably entertained by the finder of his father's property. This fortunate man has a daughter, who of course falls in love with her *chance-guest*, and *vice versa*, the guest becomes enamoured of the daughter. The father of the young man posts from town to Wales, to carry money to his son. The story of the pocket book is now revived; the farmer discovers himself as the finder, and offers restitution, which the owner declines, and rewards his honesty by giving his consent to the union of the lovers; and the piece concludes with a song and a dance—an expedient so servicesble and successful in entrapping applause, that the author has availed himself of it at the

the close of both acts. He has likewise had recourse to the hacknied tricks of most *ephemeral* play-botchers, and interlarded his production with political allusions and conundrums. These he retails with a degree of coarseness, prodigality, and want of judgment, which cannot fail to inspire every person of taste with disgust, even to *nausea* *. On this subject we took occasion in a former number, (see DRAMATIC CENSOR, page 343) to applaud the manliness and liberality of mind, manifested by the author of *The Egyptian Festival*, who, working on a theme, that from its very nature must offer frequent opportunities of appealing to national prejudices, nobly disdained to practice such mean and despicable arts.

DRAMATIS PERSONÆ.

Old Townly, - - - - - - - -	Mr. MUNDEN.
William Townly, - - - - - -	Mr. INCLEDON.
Owen, - - - - - - - - - -	Mr. TOWNSEND.
Peter Plimlimmon, - - - - - -	Mr. FAWCETT.
Dick, - - - - - - - - - -	Mr. SIMMONS.
Watkin, - - - - - - - - -	Mr. KING.
Ellen, - - - - - - - - - -	Mrs. ATKINS.
Taffline, - - - - - - - - -	Miss SIMS.
Gwinneth - - - - - - - - -	Mrs. WHITMORE.
Welch Girl, - - - - - - - -	Miss LESERVE.

* Having frequently in the discharge of our censorial function had occasion to speak in harsh terms of the unprincipled venality of *Newspaper critics*, it affords us the greater satisfaction to be able, in the present instance, to exempt the *Oracle*, and *Morning Post*, from the general charge of literary prostitution. Both these papers have given a just and accurate report of the new entertainment. Let the Editors adhere to this line of conduct, and their critical character may yet be retrieved.

Of

Of the Performers, the first praise is unquestionably due to Mr. TOWNSEND, who sustained the part of *Owen* with admirable address. MUNDEN, as *Old Townly*, supports a character, which admits of little or no display of talent. From INCLEDON, we expect nothing but *singing*, and of that he gives us plenty. FAWCETT and SIMMONS are pressed into the service, for the promotion of buffoonery. Mr. KING danced with great agility, and added *vocal* to *capering* dexterity. Miss SIMS is a lively actress, whose archness and vivacity form a striking contrast to the insipidity of Mrs. ATKINS.

DRURY-LANE, THURSDAY, *March* 27, 1800.

THE EGYPTIAN FESTIVAL—*Franklin.* THE PANNEL.

MRS. JORDAN performed the part of *Beatrice*, in the Entertainment. The house was crowded to overflow in every quarter.

COVENT-GARDEN, THURSDAY *March* 27, 1800

THE BELLE's STRATAGEM—*Mrs. Cowley.* TWO STRINGS TO YOUR BOW.

THIS Comedy, with regard to the scenic department, is very badly got up at both houses. The *auction scene*, in the second, and the *masquerade* in the fourth act, reflect disgrace upon a London Theatre. In other respects the play, upon the whole, is better *cast* at Covent Garden, than at Drury Lane. Mr. LEWIS sustains the eccentric character of *Doricourt* with great spirit. Mr. MURRAY performed the part

part of *Sir George Touchwood.* This gentleman's declamatory powers are so justly admired, that it would be superfluous to add, that he gave weight and dignity to the sentiments of the virtuous knight. Mr. MUNDEN's delineation of *Hardy* was richly fraught with humour.

Of Mr. FAWCETT's *Flutter*, we cannot give so favourable an account. Mr. PALMER acts this part with much greater address at Drury Lane. *Saville* and *Villers* are precisely in the same predicament; and Mrs. MATTOCKS, as *Mrs. Racket*, evinces too much vulgarity and coarseness. But in the person of Miss MURRAY, who performed *Lady Touchwood* for the first time, Covent Garden boasts a far superior representative than Drury Lane. The natural, unsophisticated manner of this amiable actress, admirably accords with the innocence and simplicity of *Lady Touchwood's* character. The *late* Miss BETTERTON sustained the part of *Letitia Hardy*, and was honoured with unbounded applause. But whether this favourable reception was awarded to her professional merit, or to certain domestic arrangements, connected with the *singularity* of her announcement in the Bills, it is not for us to determine. This actress, we understand, is recently married to a gentleman of the name of GLOVER. Peradventure, her *double* announcement as the *late* Miss BETTERTON, might be intended to whet the edge of curiosity, and give the greater notoriety and *eclát* to the change in her situation.

THEATRICAL

THEATRICAL CRITICISM, &c.

Involving a candid Investigation of the Pamphlet, entitled,

" A STATEMENT OF THE DIFFERENCES SUBSISTING BETWEEN THE PROPRIETORS AND *Eight* PERFORMERS OF THE THEATRE-ROYAL, COVENT-GARDEN."

Given in the Correspondence that has passed between them.

[*Continued from page* 388.]

THE *sick-clause* forms a subject of discussion, which we should be sorry to treat with a rash and rude hand. It is, however, proper to observe, that the redress of this grievance, were even the allegations of the *malecontents* supported by *proof*; were *facts* adduced, and the *names* of the parties distinctly stated, rests entirely in the breast of the Proprietors, and is cognizable in no court but that of their own feelings. As the terms of the contract reciprocally entered into between the Proprietors and the Performers, expressly and explicitly authorize the Manager (see our tenth number, page 332) to deduct for all, and every night of absence and incapacity, on the part of the Performer, whether occasioned by sickness, or otherwise, the *malecontents* cannot demand the *non-enforcement* of this clause as a matter of right. They are at liberty, if *names* are of any service to them, to style it an *obnoxious article*, and to deprecate its *obtrusion* into their agree-

ment, in terms of the highest detestation and abhorrence. But they must permit us to differ from them, when they expatiate on its injustice, which they pronounce *self-evident*. Incurring, as they do, the forfeit *voluntarily*, and with open eyes; as the deed is literally *their own*, they involve themselves in a very aukward predicament, by grumbling at their own act. They ask us (page 60) with an air of triumph—"What right has a Manager, engaging for a certain period the services of an Actor, to demand his exemption from the natural shocks that flesh is heir to? Does he not contract with a *human being*, liable to the infirmities of his *fellow mortals?*" &c.—All this, it must be confessed, is very true, and a very pretty mode of reasoning it is: but having themselves made a voluntary surrender of the operation of this plea in their favour, they must abide by the consequences. These remonstrances would, with better grace, have *preceded* the ceremony of signing and sealing the compact. As the principle, on which this clause is bottomed, avowedly respects the prevention of fraud and collusion, as they have not stated *one single* instance referable to themselves, in which the clause has been arbitrarily enforced, or made the engine of oppression, they must permit us to construe their *silence* on this head into *tacit evidence* of the Manager's generosity and forbearance, and suffer us to view the sick clause in the same light as the Proprietors represent it, viz. as a salutary check on *feigned indisposition*.

With

With the design of still more forcibly impressing upon the minds of their readers the peculiar hardships and difficulties to which Actors are exposed, they draw a comparison between *Theatrical services*, and the indentures entered into by apprentices, articled clerks, &c.—" These, and every other description of persons, (they tell us) Actors excepted, under contract for a certain term, are equally supported in sickness and in health."—But are they aware of the essential difference in the nature of these services? Does not justice demand, that when different situations are contracted with each other for the purpose of forming an estimate of the preference due to any particular line of life, the advantages and disadvantages of each should be fairly marshalled and balanced against each other? Is there no difference in the case of persons, who serve for a limited term, *without pay*, and for the major part during their *non-age*, and persons, who are amply, and, for the major part (we are speaking of the *leading and principal Performers*, of men in the predicament of Mr. MOODY's "*glorious eight*") *extravagantly* paid for their services, work or not? Nay more, is there no difference in the case of servants, whose masters not only reap the constant and *daily* fruits of their service, but receive, on the general practice, a *large premium*, more than commensurate to indemnify them against casualties; and persons, who bring their employers *nothing but their services*, and who, on an average, do not work

one-third of their time? We leave it to themselves to draw the inference.

We cannot, however, dismiss the subject, without animadverting on the *insincerity* and *narrow-minded* policy of these "glorious eight." Like the monkey in the fable, they are desirous of obtaining their ends, by making a *cat's paw* of the more *humble*, but haply, far more *meritorious* part of the profession. They come forward in their *manifesto* as the self-elected champions of the whole Thespian commonwealth. 'Tis not so much their own personal and individual advantage, as the rights of the profession at large, for which they are thus clamorously and mutinously contending. But more particularly, 'tis for the good of the *inferior* Performers, (such is the lure they hold out to the *loyalists*—such is the lure which *crafty usurpers* invariably employ to work upon the passions of the deluded multitude, and effect their own aggrandizement at the expence of those, whom they profess to befriend) 'tis from motives of compassion and refined sympathy with their *less fortunate*, and, in their eyes, *less gifted* brethren, that they sound the *tocsin* of discord, and hoist the standard of revolt! Generous, disinterested men! Who but must admire the zeal which actuates, the patriotism which inspires your conduct? and your *deeds* bear evidence to the *truth* of your professions. The Fund for the Relief of *Decayed Actors*, appears itself to be fallen into a state of decay. How nobly have ye stepped forward to support this benevo-

lent

lent institution! Is there a *single individual** among you, who does *not* subscribe his mite? Your opponents, indeed, pretend, that *some* of you have withheld your contribution, because, forsooth, ye are in circumstances which guarantee you against want! But the systematic tenor of your conduct, and the readiness with which you, Gentlemen, the *leading* and *principal* Performers of the Theatre, *volunteer* the assistance and co-operation of your mighty talents to promote the Benefit receipts of the *inferior*† Performers,

---

* Sorry should we be, if certain reports propagated on this head, were entitled to credit. *Two* of the "Glorious Eight," it is confidently asserted, have never subscribed a *shilling* towards the Theatrical Fund, and the reason alledged for their refusal, if true, demonstrates, beyond the possibility of doubt, the sincerity and tenderness of their *fellow-feeling* for the *inferior* members of the profession. 'Tis said, and to our great regret, we *know* the report to be true, that the reason they assigned for their refusal was, *that they should never want any assistance from the Fund, and therefore would not contribute to an institution from which they were not likely to reap any benefit!*

† Here again the busy tongue of scandal has not been silent. Certain *Theatrical hypercritics* have commented on the arrangement and order of the several Benefits, from which they draw inferences very opposite to that spirit of *disinterested sympathy*, which the *leading Performers* tell us impels them to fight the battles of the Theatrical community at large. 'Tis rumoured, that when *inferior* apply to *principal* Actors, to personate parts in the play selected for their Benefit, they are put off with very unsatisfactory excuses. The one is *ill*; another, having *feathered his own nest*, has obtained leave of the Manager to perform at some fashionable Country Theatre, or watering place. A third is just preparing for a trip to the North, and a fourth

Performers, or the "swinish multitude" of the profession, render it impossible to give credit to such injurious, and, we trust, unfounded reports.

It glads us, that we are drawing near the close of this malecontent *Manifesto*; though, if we judge of our progress by the impediments which open to our view, we muss confess the distance seems to grow upon us with every step. The *malecontents*, after dismissing the *sick clause*, proceed to investigate the precarious tenure on which they hold their situations. With a degree of effrontery, which we could scarcely have expected even from *veteran* insurgents, they advance a charge, to which their own practice and immediate example give *the direct negative*.—"The slightest opposition, (they contend page 66) or hesitation to accord with arbitrary demands; nay, the mere caprice of a Manager, is sufficient for an actor's expulsion, which not only amounts to banishment from one Theatre, but approaches nearly to professional annihilation; the *managerial compact* (here they are sadly deceived in their exposition of the case, as we shall speedily prove) precluding the other Theatre from opening its doors for his admis-

---

fourth is very willing to perform in any play whatever, except the identical one fixed upon by the *poor inferior* Performer who solicits his aid. Such is the *sympathy* of *usurpers*, and such the *disgraceful weakness* of the *Proprietors* and the *Manager*, that they connive at, and by connivance, lend their sanction to practices, which merit serious and exemplary reprehension.

sion."

sion."—Their own conduct affords a palpable proof of the falsehood of this assertion.

They then enter into a discussion of the nature and provisions of the Patent, by which the Proprietors hold the Theatre; and well, indeed, may it excite surprize, that men so deeply interested in the question, should be so ill informed upon this point. We have already heard them ascribe the regulation, which prohibits one Theatre from admitting the *mutinous* Performers of the other, to *managerial compact:* we need not wonder, therefore, after this consummate proof of ignorance, that they should style this compact a measure of oppression; nor is it extraordinary, that persons, who, like the "glorious eight," are in the habit of *presuming*; and *advancing*, as well as *taking*, things on trust, should plunge still deeper into error, and prate of what never happened, the *union* and *consolidation* of the two Patents granted to Sir William Davenant and Killigrew. The fact is, that neither the *malecontent* Performers, nor the Proprietors themselves, (if we may be permitted to judge of men, with whom we never exchanged a single word, nor had any sort of communication whatever) appear to be duly apprized of the tenor and principle of the Patent, in virtue of which, the one party is authorized to hold a Theatre, and the other to act in the same, *without incurring the punishment of vagrancy*. As we conceive a due understanding on this point to be of material consequence; as this subject appears to have been totally

lost

lost sight of in the controversy; as scarcely a hint, or if a hint, a very remote and imperfect one, has been given in any of our public prints, we shall present our readers with a concise, but faithful sketch of the leading features and provisions of the said Patent. And this we are enabled to do, not in consequence of any *recent* information, but because on occasion of a former publication, written by the author of these remarks, and which was originally intended to embrace a wide field of Theatrical criticism, (we allude to *The Literary Census*) we pursued that line of conduct, which it behoves every public writer to pursue, *viz.* to inform himself fully and completely of the subject which he undertakes to discuss.

Be it known then to the "glorious eight," and to the public in general, that the Patent, originally granted to Mr. Davenant, afterwards Sir William Davenant, by Charles I. was, on account of its *local* restrictions, the Theatre being confined to the vicinity of Fleet Street, and limited in its dimensions to forty square feet, surrendered by Sir William Davenant, to Charles II. who granted a *new* Patent in lieu thereof, extending the scite of ground to any part of the cities of London and Westminster, with the suburbs thereof, and leaving the dimensions of the Theatre entirely at the option of the Patentee. The purposes for which the said Patent was granted, embraced the representation of all Tragedies, Comedies, Dancing, Music Scenes, and every other

other entertainments, *governing*, *privileging*, (for without the sanction of this grant, all the Performers in a London Theatre are *vagabonds by act of parliament*) and keeping the Actors, should be vested *solely* and *entirely* in the Patentee, his heirs, administrators, and assigns; and that it should be lawful for the said Sir WILLIAM DAVENANT to perform and enact Plays, Music Scenes, &c. without *impeachment*, or *impediment of any person whatsoever*. Thus it appears that the Patentee was subject to *no manner of control*, even from the highest officer of state. And further, that it shall be lawful to the said Sir WILLIAM DAVENANT, his heirs, administrators and assigns, to take *such* sums of money for admission, as may be *customary*, or as shall be thought *reasonable by him*, the said Sir WILLIAM DAVENANT, in consequence of the expence of scenes, music, and such *new decorations*, as have not been *formerly* used. And that *he*, the Patentee, shall have power to allow whatever *he shall think fit* to the Actors in his employ. And (here follows a clause, which the *malecontents* would do well to ponder and consider with becoming attention) *all* SCANDALOUS *and* MUTINOUS *persons shall, from time to time by him, the said* Sir WILLIAM DAVENANT, *his heirs, &c.* be EJECTED, *and* DISABLED *from playing in the said Theatre.*—(Hence it is evident, that it is not only the undoubted right, but the absolute *duty* of the Manager, the very *sine qua non* by which he holds his Patent, to *discharge every disturber of peace and good*

order.)—And the better to preserve amity and correspondence between the two Theatres, (Sir WILLIAM DAVENANT'S company and KILLIGREW'S) and that the one may not encroach on the other, it is ordained, that no Actor, or other person *ejected* by, or *deserting* one Theatre, shall be received by the *Governor* of the other, without the consent and approbation of the *Governor*, from whose company he may have been *ejected*, or whose service he has *deserted*, signified under the said *Governor's* own hand and seal.*

We have presented our readers with this succinct account of the nature of the Patent, to show how shallow, capricious, and nugatory, are the claims made by the *malecontents* on the one hand; and how ample, full, and uncontroled, on the other, the

* From this circumstance, we leave our readers to judge of the propriety of terming the regulation relative to the *non-admission* of Performers from one Theatre into the other, without proper acquittal, a *managerial compact*. We are not a little at a loss, to account for the supineness of Managers, in not publishing the form of their Patent, as the several clauses in that deed, may jusly be styled the *articles of war*, by which the *malecontents* ought to be tried, and like other offenders, punished for mutiny and disobedience. We have no communication, directly or indirectly, with either of the parties concerned in the present contest, otherwise we would suggest to the Proprietors the expediency of promulgating the grant of Charles II. which, in our opinion, boasts all the powers, immunities, and inviolability of a charter. Mean while, those of our readers, who are desirous of obtaining further information on this point, may satisfy their curiosity by consulting the archives of the *British Museum.*

authority

authority vested in the Patentee. It is not our wish to press the case to extremities; we shall therefore content ourselves with giving the *malecontents* seasonable warning of the danger of *contumacy*, that they may acknowledge their error, ere it be too late, and return to their allegiance, if they can be permitted to retain their situations with safety to the concern. But if they persist in their revolt, there is just ground of alarm, that an *amnesty* would only tend to encourage *future* disturbances, and disseminate a general spirit of revolutionary and jacobinical usurpation.

They next, to swell the measure of their pretended wrongs, complain of certain new regulations, which, from the hasty manner in which they are passed over by the *malecontents*, may be supposed to refer to that subordinate class of grievances, for which Mr. LEWIS offered them *prompt* and *immediate* redress; (see page 10) but which these refractory *delegates* refused to accept. The first respects the right of an Actor to the parts he has originally been in the habit of studying and performing: the second is of too trifling a nature to deserve mention, viz. the "discontinuance of the Managers to provide several articles; as for instance, refreshments, &c. used by the Performers professionally." In answer to the former complaint, we have only to observe, that the very nature of the case renders the absolute retention of a character impracticable. A part is often given to an Actor, on account of the illness of

the original Performer. If the substitute acquits himself with greater success, and greater approbation than his predecessor, is it unjust, on the part of the Manager, to avail himself of the superior talents of the *locum tenens?* Again, many characters are of a description, which requires congeniality of years in the representative. That worthy and highly respected Performer, Mr. HULL, for instance, was formerly wont to personate the *younger brother* in the Mask of *Comus*. Would propriety sanction his retention of that character in declining age? A variety of parallel cases will naturally suggest themselves to the reader's observation.

As the *malecontents* have, after the example of all *usurpers*, endeavoured to carry their point by the affectation of popularity, and by pretending to make a joint cause with their more humble comrades, we shall again beg leave to caution the *inferior* Performers, against rashly courting the hug of this worse than *French fraternity*. Had these *ringleaders* succeeded in their attempts, would the *inferior* part of the profession have reaped any benefit by this Theatrical revolution? We promised, in the first part of our disquisitions, (see DRAMATIC CENSOR, page 285) to offer a few remarks, on what we conceived an *actual* grievance, but of which these *self-dubbed leading* and *principal* Performers scorned to take any notice, as it did not personally concern themselves. The circumstance to which we allude, is the *invidious distinction* in the occupancy of the two Green Rooms.

Rooms. Many of the *inferior* Performers, we are persuaded, have severely smarted under the shock of *outraged sensibility*, by the *supercilious* demeanour of these *malecontent* RINGLEADERS. Have no *inferior* Performers been absolutely *scouted* (to adopt a technical term) by these *sympathizing* gentlemen; these self-elected avengers of the wrongs of the profession at large? Are these champions of justice and of right, to be now told, that the system of a Theatre resembles a complicated piece of machinery, in which the *ſmaller wheels are as essentially serviceable, and more delicately to be treated than the larger?* Are they now to be informed of the cause and origin of this *Green-Room division?* Certainly they must be well aware, that in the first institution of the Theatre, dancing constituted a principal part of the Entertainment. The habitual *restlessness*, and invincible propensity of the *figurants*, to cut capers and play antics, being found to interfere with, and disturb the studies of the *Performers*, who were reading over their parts, *separate* rooms were assigned to the players and the dancers. This circumstance, no doubt, will recal to the memory of many of our readers, a *witticism* of the celebrated QUIN, which we shall take the liberty to repeat, as it affords an illustration of our remarks. That eccentric actor being put out of patience, with the perpetual motion of the dancers, called out to the prompter, "why don't you hang these *figures on pegs*, till they are wanted?"—Thus it appears, that the right of admission

admission to the principal Green Room, was not regulated by the *salary*, but by the *sphere of action* of the several Performers.

We shall not, however, enlarge on this topic, as we hasten to conclude our *Strictures* on a pamphlet, which has given rise to a far greater length of disquisition, than we originally intended or conceived necessary. The *malecontents*, having now nearly exhausted their *budget of grievances*, attempt a *captatio benevolentiæ* to the MONARCH, whose gracious interference they hope to obtain, by the most unbounded professions of loyalty, veneration, and esteem, for his sacred person and character. But of the *sincerity* of these professions, we leave our readers to decide from the following recent occurrence, the authenticity of which we take upon ourselves to vouch for. It is not many weeks since, that his MAJESTY commanded a play and farce, in both of which, one of the most *popular* of this *loyal* "glorious eight," sustains a principal part. We have already seen (DRAMATIC CENSOR, page 330) that every Performer is *bound* on all occasions to act in *every* dramatic piece, whether play, interlude, or farce, of which he shall receive timely and customary notice from the Manager. Obedience, therefore, was the duty of this *component* member of the "glorious eight," even on *ordinary* occasions; but when the regular call of duty was enforced by the ROYAL MANDATE, *chearful* and *immediate* compliance might surely have been expected from so *loyal* a gentleman. What was the

actual

actual event? The summons being *officially* delivered, this profound reverer of his MAJESTY, this petitioner of ROYALTY, who joins the rest of his *malecontent* brethren, in assuring us, (page 64) " that it has ever been their *greatest glory*, to see the drama so *highly honoured* with the attention of our GRACIOUS MONARCH, as to be made a favourite means of relaxation from the toils of sovereignty;" absolutely, and in vulgar terms, *refused* to pay that obedience to his SOVEREIGN; to that MONARCH, " to whose protecting care," he tells us, " he looks up for the removal of oppression," which he is *compellable* to pay to a *private* individual! He repeats again, and again, " that he will not *condescend* (though *bound in a penalty* to comply with the *Manager's* command) to act in play and farce, to please either Mr. HARRIS, or the KING!" Such were his express words *deliberately* spoken, and *reiterated* when cautioned of his offence. Did he persist in his refusal? No! he *did* condescend to perform both in *play* and *farce*. But this condescension was *extorted* from him, not by his veneration for his SOVEREIGN, but by his fears of the just consequences of rebellion and disobedience. " Tell them," he said, " *at their peril* (it should seem from this expression, that the *mutineers* conceived themselves in a situation to carry their point by force, *vi et armis*) to put up *my* name." The Manager, greatly to his honour, encountered that peril; and apprized the *malecontent*, that in case of persistance in his refusal, he should himself come

forward

forward on the stage, and inform his ROYAL VISITORS of the cause, and quarter, in which disobedience and disappointment originated. This resolute measure produced the desired effect; prudence accomplished, what loyalty was inadequate to perform; the haughty *malecontent* did, *par-force*, his duty. Haply the moment of more determined hostility was not yet arrived! Haply his confederates in revolt did not deem their project yet ripe for execution! Haply the *embodied fears* of the "glorious eight," overcame the *isolated heroism* of the individual, and induced compliance. After such damning facts as these, what faith, what reliance are we authorized to place in their unsupported assertion, (page 67) or rather their "*trust*, that their general conduct will bear testimony of their proper respect for every establishment, which *ought* to exist in a *well-regulated* Theatre?"

We shall stop but to animadvert on one passage more in their *Manifesto*, and then take our leave of their ill-digested and ill-advised pamphlet.—After having, with *wonderful modesty*, expatiated on the injury they have suffered from the *Tontine*—a measure to which *their consent* (we quote their own words, page 66) *was not even asked!*—they advance, as a plea for an *increase of profit*, on their part, that there is a possibility of the *Proprietors* being entirely *ruined*, by the *caprice of the Town*; and that, should the Public withdraw their favour from Covent-Garden Theatre, there would be an end of their income

income. Thus, they strive to make it appear, that their risque is commensurate with that of the Proprietors; though we find, that, unless the House be *totally* shut up, the Performers, however small may be the receipts of the Theatre, and even when the expences of the night (as frequently happens in bad and inclement weather) exceed the night's income, receive their full amount of wages, without the smallest deduction whatsoever. Surely this circumstance, instead of making in favour of their requisitions, must, in the eye of common sense, enhance the right of the Proprietors to the *undivided* profits of the concern (the Performers being duly and regularly paid their allotted wages), in order that they may be enabled to bear up against a *partial* loss, and to provide (if we may be allowed the homely, but, in this instance, very appropriate phrase) against *a rainy day*.—If the Proprietors were not great gainers, on the ultimate event, how would it be in their power to fulfil their engagements with the Performers?

The *malecontents*, however, by a *parody* of a passage in POPE's *Eloisa to Abelard*—

"*The crime was common, common be the pain*—"

still persist in their demand. They tell the Treasurer (page 66),

"*The risque is mutual, mutual be the gain!*"

and follow up this *requisition* with an assertion founded on the most flagrant injustice, ignorance,

and wilful misrepresentation.—" We *presume*," they write, " we have fully shown, that, while the pro-" fits of Proprietors are abundantly superior to what " were known at any former period, the incomes of " Actors, instead of being *advanced* in proportion, " are most *sensibly diminished*."—To demonstrate the falsehood of this statement, we shall produce the following document——

It appears that, on a former occasion, when a dispute arose between the Patentees and the Performers, the *Proprietors* discharged the task which the *malecontents*, in the present instance, have so obligingly taken upon themselves, and published a Statement of the Income of the *Principal* and *Leading* Performers of that day, to " show how little cause they had to mutiny." From this statement we find, that whereas the two *worst-paid* members of the " glorious eight" receive Ten Pounds; five of them Twelve, and *one* Fourteen Pounds, per week! the *average* of principal Actors, at that period, when the profits of Performers, according to the miserable pamphlet of the *malecontents*, were greater than at present, did not exceed, with all collateral sources of revenue, the sum of *Five Pounds* per week.—Mr. COLLEY CIBBER, from the time of letting his share till he left the Stage, received £12. 12*s*. per week: Mr. THEOPHILUS CIBBER, £5. and his wife's salary till her death: Mr. MILLER, jun. £3. under the same circumstances with regard to his wife: Mr. MILLER, sen. £1. per day, for two

hundred

hundred days certain, and a clear benefit: Mr. MILLER (better known by the illustrious name of *Joe Miller*, whose fame surpasses that of any *living* Actor whatever) £5. per week, paid him eight weeks before he performed, besides a present of ten guineas: Mr. HARPER, £4. and a like present of ten guineas: Mr. SHEPHARD, jun. £3: Mr. SHEPHARD, the father, £3: Mrs. HERON, £3: Mrs. BUTLER, £3. And we must further observe, that, when these salaries were given, the *whole expences* of the night, allowing for Performers wages, &c. did not amount to Fifty Pounds.

Enough, we hope, has been said, to prove that the Statement, or rather *Manifesto*, of the *male-contents*, forms, with very few exceptions, one mass of falsehood, error, and misrepresentation. They conclude, like most persons in the wrong, with *prejudging their own cause*, and flatter themselves, that "their endeavours will be accompanied with the wishes of all *good* men." They are, poor "Gentlemen! in a state of oppression, which no other subjects in the kingdom can possibly experience!"—How far this declaration squares with the evidence of facts, we have amply demonstrated.

Subjoined to the pamphlet, we find a *Supplement*, containing a proposal, on the part of the Proprietors, to refer the subject of dispute to the decision of the LORD CHAMBERLAIN. This proposal, the "glorious eight" treat with sovereign contempt, and persist in their determination to forestall the CHAMBERLAIN'S

BERLAIN's verdict, by a printed appeal to the public. They again urge their anxiety to appear in the world in *their true garb*, and we sincerely congratulate them on the accomplishment of their wishes; for the public now have had their eyes opened, and regard these *worthies* in their true light and character.

Wishing to render the DRAMATIC CENSOR a *complete record*, and *documental repository* of the whole proceedings, connected with this Theatrical controversy, we shall in our next Number, which will commence the *Second Volume* of this work, take a succinct retrospect of the special pleadings, on the case, *pro* and *con*, maintained through the medium of the newspapers. Mean while we would recommend submisssion, and a return to allegiance, as the *malecontents* must now be convinced of the *danger*, as well as *folly* of resistance.

END OF VOL. I.

N. B. An INDEX and TITLE PAGE to the First Volume, will be given as soon as convenient.

☞ We have received a variety of Letters from our Friends and Correspondents, which, though we have not yet been able to answer, are not intended to remain unnoticed.

London: Printed by W. JUSTINS, Pemberton Row, Goug Square, Fleet Street.